

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Southern Political Science Association

Bureaucratic Politics and Administration in Chile. by Peter S. Cleaves

Review by: Lawrence S. Graham

The Journal of Politics, Vol. 38, No. 1 (Feb., 1976), pp. 207-208

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of the [Southern Political Science Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2128987>

Accessed: 05/02/2014 09:07

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and Southern Political Science Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Politics*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

case study. It can be a fruitful source of propositions for other case studies and for longitudinal and comparative analyses as well. It clearly reveals the complexity of the policy-making process, and it can serve as a guide to warn other analysts against the facile oversimplification which has characterized so much of the work in this field.

JOHN H. BAKER, *Southern Illinois University at Carbondale*

Bureaucratic Politics and Administration in Chile. By PETER S. CLEAVES. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974. Pp. xviii, 352. \$16.75.)

Central to Cleaves's analysis of Chilean bureaucracy is the argument that in order to comprehend the dynamics of public bureaucracy in Third World countries one would be best off to reject the perspectives of comparative and development administration and begin anew by building on the foundations of administrative theory in the United States and Western Europe. Utilizing a political economy perspective, Cleaves examines bureaucratic politics during the Frei and Allende administrations by focusing on the budgetary process and the battle for limited resources within the housing sector.

Insofar as new data are concerned, the book provides the reader with a mass of information on public organizations and the interaction among major bureaucratic interests in Chile. Accordingly, it represents the first serious attempt to tap the richness of organizational life in the public sector of countries outside the United States and Western Europe. Hitherto one of the major deficiencies in public administration has been the absence of cross-national analysis in the Third World detailing relations among governmental agencies and the nature of bureaucratic politics. Thus, as a case study of organizational dynamics in a single country outside the range of countries usually dealt with in public administration, it constitutes an important addition to our knowledge of bureaucratic politics and a healthy corrective to the diffuseness of much of the earlier writing on administration in non-U.S. settings.

If these then are the book's merits, readers should also be aware

of several deficiencies. After some 300 pages devoted to budgeting and housing, the concluding chapter does not pull together prior arguments very successfully. Nor does it contribute much to raising the level of analysis from an isolated case study to something relevant to wider theory-building endeavors. Much of this is due, I think, to the author's frame of reference. Given the failures of the comparative administration movement, it may well be that in examining administration in a country such as Chile the concepts and approaches identified with American public administration provide a more solid foundation from which to begin. Yet such a view is not without a certain amount of cultural arrogance, no matter how adept one is in the choice of words.

For all the limitations of comparative and development administration, one should not forget that the movement arose originally out of a desire to look at administration in other countries in terms relevant to those societies. The closed organization perspective utilized here limits one to the immediate task environment of the organizations under study and thereby runs the risk of ignoring significant environmental differences. After all, solid arguments have been presented elsewhere regarding the importance of examining the wider context in which organizations function. Those articulated by Michel Crozier regarding the significance of variation in culture, or by Ezra Suleiman on the distribution of political power within the nation-state, or by Naomi Caiden and Aaron Wildavsky on the allocation of economic resources, all point to important environmental determinants of bureaucratic behavior beyond the immediate context of the organization. Consideration of variables such as these could have enhanced this study greatly.

LAWRENCE S. GRAHAM, *University of Texas at Austin*

Multinational Corporations and the Politics of Dependence: Copper in Chile. By THEODORE H. MORAN. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974. Pp. xiv, 286. \$12.50.)

Within the past two or three years the multinational corporation has become an extremely popular subject for comment by governmental organizations, various interest groups, journalists, and aca-